

NCER Working Paper Series

Asymmetric unemployment rates dynamics in Australia

Gunnar Bårdsen
Stan Hurn
Zoë McHugh

Working Paper #71
February 2011

Asymmetric unemployment rate dynamics in Australia*

Gunnar Bårdsen[†]

Stan Hurn[‡]

Zoë McHugh[§]

Abstract

The unemployment rate in Australia is modelled as an asymmetric and non-linear function of aggregate demand, productivity, real interest rates, the replacement ratio and the real exchange rate. If changes in unemployment are big, the management of of demand, real interest rates and the replacement ratio will be good instruments to start bringing it down. The model is developed by exploiting recent developments in automated model-selection procedures.

Keywords

unemployment,
non-linearity,
dynamic modelling,
aggregate demand,
real wages.

JEL Classification: C12; C52; C87; E24; E32.

*Part of the research for this paper was undertaken while Gunnar Bårdsen was visiting CRE-ATES as Visiting Fellow. The hospitality and stimulating research environment provided is gratefully acknowledged.

[†]Norwegian University of Science and Technology. Corresponding author: gunnar.bardsen@svt.ntnu.no

[‡]Queensland University of Technology.

[§]Aberdeen Asset Managers Limited.

1 Introduction

There is a growing body of research which points to the fact that the unemployment rate in both the U.S. (?????) and Europe (????) exhibits asymmetric behaviour in the sense that it increases more quickly than it decreases. Various explanations of this non-linear behaviour have been offered in the literature. For example, ? uses ? simple search and matching model to explain cyclical asymmetry in unemployment rate fluctuations in the U.S. He finds that the asymmetry comes from an adverse productivity shock, which brings about the destruction of certain jobs in the economy that are not recreated as aggregate economic conditions improve, forcing individuals to seek out new job opportunities. ?, ?, and ? also use various search and matching models to explain the behaviour of the unemployment rate in the US. A related literature has pointed to asymmetries in Okun's Law where changes in output can cause asymmetric changes in the unemployment rate (????). Finally, several papers relate non-linearities to hysteresis (??).

Empirical evidence also exists on the non-linear properties of the aggregate Australian unemployment rate (????). While these non-linear models show that the aggregate unemployment rate in Australia does indeed behave differently during periods of low and high unemployment, they do not have an effective explanation of what drives the unemployment rate to increase at such a rapid rate or what contributes to its much slower decrease.

This paper makes two contributions. In the first instance, it is demonstrated that aggregate demand, the real interest rate, productivity, the replacement ratio, and the real exchange rate are all important factors in the asymmetry in the Australian unemployment rate. The second contribution is methodological. It is shown that automated model-selection techniques for linear models, introduced by ? and developed by ?? and ?, can be adapted quite easily to applications in non-linear environments, by testing a linearized expansion of the non-linear model against its linear alternative.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 sets out a simple LSTAR model of the unemployment rate and demonstrates the key features of the model that enables it to capture asymmetries in the data. Section 3 looks at the asymmetry in the Australian unemployment rate and explores possible candidate drivers of unemployment variation. In Section 4 an enhanced non-linear modelling cycle is implemented based on the automated model-selection procedures available in the *Autometrics* software ?. The empirical results obtained are evaluated in Section 5. The end result is a model of the Australian unemployment rate

with non-linear behaviour due to rigidities caused by a complex interplay of many factors. Section 6 is a brief conclusion.

2 Asymmetries in Unemployment

Figure 1 plots the evolution of the Australian unemployment rate from 1979 to 2010. It shows how large, swift upward changes are followed by slow, downward drifts. This casual empiricism lends support to the hypothesis that there is a relationship between aggregate economic shocks and the rate of unemployment which may be further clarified within the context of a model of asymmetric unemployment dynamics.




Figure 1: Australia's aggregate unemployment rate for the period 1979:4 to 2010:2. The shaded areas represent recessions in the classical cycle.

There are several additional interesting aspects of the period 1979-2010. According to the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research,¹ Australia experienced two classical recessions during this time, namely September 1981 to May 1983 and December 1989 to December 1992. To these may be added the downturn due to the current global financial crisis. The dates of these three recessions, and the subsequent recoveries, appear to coincide with the rapid increases and the gradual decreases in the rate of unemployment.

¹See <http://www.ecom.unimelb.edu.au/iaesrwww/bcf/bdates5197.html>.

According to ?, this non-linear behaviour is consistent with large, linear responses to economic shocks, followed by slow, non-linear movements towards equilibrium. They propose a simple univariate LSTAR model as a useful way of summarizing the main features of the asymmetric behaviour of the unemployment rate. To highlight the main properties of the model, a version with only first-order dynamics in equilibrium correction (EqC) form is considered

$$\Delta U_t = -\alpha_1 \left(U_{t-1} - \frac{\mu_1}{\alpha_1} \right) - \alpha_2 \left(U_{t-1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\alpha_2} \right) G_t + \varepsilon_t$$

with $0 < (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) < 1$ and

$$G_t = [(1 + \exp\{-\gamma (\Delta U_{t-1} - c)\})]^{-1}, \quad \gamma > 0.$$

The parameter c is the threshold that determines the size of the shock that is required for the activation of the transition function $G(\cdot)$ and the value of γ determines the speed of the change in $G(\cdot)$ from the value of zero to unity in the vicinity of the threshold.

Assume a constant long-run equilibrium rate of unemployment μ_1/α_1 for which $\Delta U_t = 0$, and therefore $G_t = 0$. Suppose a positive shock affects unemployment such that $\Delta U_t > c$ and $G_t = 1$. In the next period, the growth in unemployment ΔU_t will be given by

$$\Delta U_t = -(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \left(U_{t-1} - \frac{\mu_1 + \mu_2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \right) + \varepsilon_t,$$

which will imply a rapid increase in U_t towards $(\mu_1 + \mu_2)/(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$. The restrictions on the parameters ensure that ΔU_t will fall below c as U_t approaches $(\mu_1 + \mu_2)/(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$, which has the effect of resetting the transition function G_t to zero and returning the process for ΔU_t to

$$\Delta U_t = -\alpha_1 (U_{t-1} - \mu_1/\alpha_1) + \varepsilon_t.$$

If the value of α_1 is relatively small, the return of the unemployment rate towards its long-run equilibrium level μ_1/α_1 is likely to be slow, mimicking the observed near-hysteresis properties of unemployment rates.

This deceptively simple model, therefore, has the potential to mimic the asymmetric fluctuations in the Australian unemployment rate and therefore provides a

useful point of departure for the empirical investigation. The parameter estimates² this benchmark univariate specification, enhanced with slightly richer dynamics and using the lagged two-quarter-ended growth rate of unemployment, $\Delta_2 U_{t-1}$, as the transition variable, are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: A benchmark LSTAR model of the Australian unemployment rate for the period 1979:4 to 2010:2. The transition variable is $\Delta_2 U_{t-1}$.

Coefficients	Estimates	Std. Errors	t-values
Linear parameters:			
μ_1	0.12	0.104	1.15
U_{t-1}	-0.03	0.015	-2.20
ΔU_{t-1}	0.11	0.166	0.64
Transition parameters:			
γ	24.47	20.490	1.20
c	0.15	0.040	3.82
Non-linear parameters:			
μ_2	0.55	0.223	2.48
U_{t-1}	-0.04	0.029	-1.43
ΔU_{t-1}	0.53	0.209	2.53
Diagnostics:			
RSS	6.06	$\hat{\sigma}$	0.23
AIC	-2.89	SC	-2.73
$F_{AR(1-5)}(5, 110)$	1.00 [0.42]	$F_{RESET}(2, 113)$	2.84 [0.06]

The coefficient on U_{t-1} in the linear regime of -0.03 implies a relatively slow adjustment to equilibrium to the implied long-run unemployment level of 4%. As-

²Estimation of the LSTAR models was conducted using Ivar Pettersen's *STR2* compiled *Ox-Pack* routines translated from Gauss programmes written by Timo Teräsvirta and the non-linear algorithms in *Oxmetrics6*. The following abbreviations will be used for the diagnostics reported with the estimation results: residual sum of squares, RSS; the standard error of the regression, $\hat{\sigma}$; Akaike Information Criterion, AIC; Schwartz Information Criterion, SC; the chi-square version of the test for normality of the regression residuals, $\chi^2_{normality}$, with the appropriate degrees of freedom in brackets; and the F-forms of the Lagrange Multiplier tests for autocorrelation, F_{AR} , heteroskedasticity, F_{het} and functional form, F_{RESET} , with the appropriate degrees of freedom in brackets.

sume that a shock to aggregate demand induces a 6 month rise of 0.15 percentage points in the unemployment rate, the speed of adjustment to the higher unemployment equilibrium level of 9.6% is nearly doubled to -0.07 . This disparity in the speeds of adjustment in the two regimes is of the order of magnitude that would support the pattern of asymmetry in the behaviour of the unemployment rate illustrated in Figure 1.

The estimate of the parameter governing the speed of the transition from periods of low to periods of high unemployment, $\hat{\gamma} = 24.47$, indicates a very abrupt transition in the vicinity of the threshold, $\hat{c} = 0.15$. This fact that $\hat{\gamma}$ is not statistically significant is characteristic of LSTAR models where the value of this parameter is difficult to pin down with great precision (?).

This specification is only a preliminary one and as such only a minimum set of diagnostics are reported, but there does appear to be support from this simple univariate model for the hypothesis that a non-linear model may be required to capture the behaviour of the Australian unemployment rate. The interesting economic question to ask, however, is what fundamental economic drivers are responsible for the non-linear behaviour, so that this univariate, autoregressive specification can be improved upon.

3 Sources of Variation in Unemployment

Empirical studies on Australia have consistently found statistical support for a negative relationship between aggregate demand and unemployment and a positive relationship between real wages and unemployment (?????). These findings are also consistent with results obtained from reduced-form equations of the unemployment rate in structural labour market models (??????). Further support is provided by more descriptive work, which demonstrates that a common theme in papers on unemployment in Australia is that business cycle fluctuations and real wage growth are the two primary factors influencing Australian unemployment (?????).

Theories of unemployment, however, identify more diverse sources of unemployment variation, many of which are nicely summed up in the matching model of unemployment (?, chapter 9). In this model, unemployment is predicted to be positively correlated with the replacement ratio, productivity, and the real interest rate, and negatively correlated with shocks to aggregate demand. Some of these effects are also predicted by other labour market models, like the efficiency wage theories, and some are in line with standard macroeconomic theory. As a special

case, one notion of disequilibrium unemployment is that in steady state of most growth models, as for example in the Ramsey model, the real interest rate is equal to the real growth rate of output. This explanation of unemployment was indeed verified empirically by ?. Furthermore, these predictions are roughly in line with the conclusions drawn from the seminal study of ?. Finally, the importance of the real exchange rate has to be taken into account in a small open economy like Australia. An increase in the real exchange rate will increase the consumer price level. Nominal wages must go up to keep real consumption wages unchanged, increasing real product wages and therefore reduce employment and increase unemployment.

Informed by these theories of unemployment, the data used to model the Australian unemployment rate, U , are seasonally adjusted, quarterly observations for the period 1978:3 to 2010:2 of the following variables: real GDP, Y ; the long-term real interest rate, R ; the replacement ratio, RPR ; labour productivity, PR ; and the real exchange rate, RXR .




Figure 2: The four-quarter change in the unemployment rate $\Delta_4 U_t$ compared to the four-quarter growth rates of interest corrected output growth rate, $(\mathbb{D}_4 Y - R)$ (panel a), productivity growth $\mathbb{D}PR$ (panel b), growth rate of the replacement ratio $\mathbb{D}RPR$ (panel c), and the real exchange rate, $\mathbb{D}RXR$ (panel d).

The potential significance of these candidate drivers of unemployment³ is illustrated in Figure 2, which plots the four quarter changes in the unemployment rate, $\Delta_4 U_t$, against the interest corrected annualized output growth rate $(\mathbb{D}_4 Y - R)$, productivity growth $\mathbb{D}PR$, the growth rate of the replacement ratio, $\mathbb{D}RPR$, and the growth rate of the real exchange rate, $\mathbb{D}RXR$. As can be seen, four-quarter changes in the unemployment rate seem negatively correlated with interest corrected output growth rates (panel a) and appreciation of the real exchange rate (panel d). There also seems to be a positive correlation with productivity growth

³Appendix A provides a detailed description of the data and the relevant sources. For simplicity, the following notational conventions are adopted. The k-period *difference* of the variable x_t be denoted $\Delta_k x_t$, so, for example, the four-quarter difference is $\Delta_4 x_t$. Note, however, that the corresponding k-period *growth rate* of the variable x_t will be denoted $\mathbb{D}_k x_t \equiv \Delta_k x_t / x_{t-k}$.

(panel b), while the linear dependence on the replacement ratio growth rate (panel c) after the upward shift in unemployment benefits in 1985-86 is less clear. These observations suggest that the tentative dynamic specification of the aggregate unemployment rate in Australia will, at the very least, need to be augmented by the inclusion of aggregate demand, the replacement ratio and productivity. In addition the effects of interest rates and the real exchange rate will need to be controlled for.⁴

Having established null hypotheses both about the general functional form as well as the forcing variables, the most important task of specifying and testing the model remains. Since all variables can enter both linearly and non-linearly, the problem of model specification is highly accentuated. We therefore propose to use automated model selection techniques to test the proposed model.

4 Automated Model Selection

In this section, a modelling cycle of specification, estimation, evaluation and encompassing of a non-linear econometric model within an automated modelling environment is described. Consider the general smooth transition model

$$\Delta U_t = \phi' X_t + \theta' X_t G_t(\gamma, c, S_t) + \epsilon_t \quad (1)$$

$$G_t = [(1 + \exp\{-\gamma(S_t - c)\})]^{-1}, \quad \gamma > 0. \quad (2)$$

$$S_t = \frac{\Delta_2 U_{t-1}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\Delta_2 U_{t-1})}}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$X_t = [1, U_{t-1}, \Delta U_{t-l}, \mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-m}, R_{t-m}, \mathbb{D}RPR_{t-m}, \mathbb{D}PR_{t-m}, \mathbb{D}RXR_{t-m}]',$$

for $l = 1, \dots, 4$ and $m = 0, \dots, 4$.

Following ??, the non-linear smooth-transition model may be linearized by using a Taylor expansion of the logistic function in equation (2), to give

$$\Delta U_t = \beta_0' X_t + \beta_1' X_t S_t + \beta_2' X_t S_t^2 + \beta_3' X_t S_t^3 + \nu_t. \quad (4)$$

A test for linearity against the LSTR specification involves an F-test of the joint hypothesis

$$H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0.$$

⁴Unit root tests confirmed that the relevant changes and growth rates of the variables and the level of the interest rate are stationary. These results are not reported but are available from the authors.

A more efficient approach, however, could be to test not only against non-linearity, but simultaneously to test down the general linear specification of equation (4) to obtain a correctly specified linear model. With the model in this form, the testing down of the general linearized model (4) may be conducted by means of an automated model-selection program.⁵ For this purpose the automated modelling procedures available in the software *Autometrics*, developed by ? are used.

The modelling cycle may now be described as follows.

Step 1: Specification.

Given the number of variables in the full Taylor expansion in equation (4), the suggestion of ? is followed and only the 3rd-order term is used. The general linear model that is passed to *Autometrics* for testing is

$$\Delta U_t = \beta_0 X_t + \beta_3' X_t S_t^3 + \nu_t. \quad (5)$$

Autometrics conducts a specification search of equation (5) and returns the chosen specification. If the chosen model returns the coefficient values $\beta_3 = 0$, then the final model is linear and the modelling cycle is complete. If, on the other hand, the model chosen by *Autometrics* includes non-zero values for any of the elements of β_3 , then the hypothesis of linearity is rejected. In this instance, the modelling cycle proceeds to Step 2.

Step 2: Estimation.

Let $X_{0,t}$ and $X_{3,t}$ contain those elements of X_t with corresponding non-zero elements in β_0 and β_3 in the specification chosen by *Autometrics* in Step 1. The LSTAR model to be estimated is then

$$\Delta U_t = \delta_0' X_{0,t} + \delta_3' X_{3,t} G_t(\gamma, c, S_t) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (6)$$

where the function $G_t(\cdot)$ and the transition variable S_t are given in equations (2) and (3) respectively.

Step 3: Evaluation and encompassing.

Step 2 yields estimates of the parameters $\hat{\gamma}$ and \hat{c} which may then be used to create an observed transition function, $\hat{G}_t(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{c}, S_t)$. Augmenting the general linearized model (5) to include this function yields the linear equation

$$\Delta U_t = \theta_0' X_t + \theta_3' X_t S_t^3 + \kappa_3' X_{3,t} \hat{G}_t(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{c}, S_t) + \eta_t \quad (7)$$

⁵We are grateful to David Hendry who suggested this approach to us—see also ?.

enables a test of parsimonious encompassing (?, p. 511), corresponding to the joint test of

$$H_0 : \theta_0 = \delta_0, \theta_3 = 0, \kappa_3 = \delta_3,$$

conditional on $\widehat{G}_t(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{c}, S_t)$. This test is again easily implemented by letting *Autometrics* evaluate (7), and see if the outcome is the estimated LSTAR from (6). If so, the test statistic is the F-test of omitted variables in the final specification.

5 Empirical Results

The results obtained in each of the steps of the enhanced modelling cycle described in the previous section are now discussed in turn.

5.1 Step1: Specification

The specification of the general linear model chosen by *Autometrics* is reported in Table 2. These results suggest that, although there are strong and significant linear effects from both output growth ($\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t = -0.15$) and labour productivity growth ($\mathbb{D}PR_t = 0.08$), the model rejects the hypothesis of linearity through the joint significance of the many interaction terms. The presence of the cubic terms is rejection of a null hypothesis of linearity with a LSTR specification as the alternative, see ?. It is interesting to note the coefficients of mean reversion, respectively $U_{t-1} = -0.07$ and $S_t^3 \cdot U_{t-1} = -0.08$. When changes in unemployment are below the threshold required to trigger the transition function, the Australian unemployment rate exhibits strong hysteresis. This would be consistent with the long slow decline in the unemployment rate observed at various times the data. When unemployment changes are big, the adjustment speed towards the higher equilibrium level more than doubles to $U_{t-1} + S_t^3 \cdot U_{t-1} = -(0.07 + 0.08)$. In addition, the replacement ratio enters in interaction with the transition variable which may be due to this variable having stronger effect in periods of high unemployment.

5.2 Step 2: Estimation

Based upon the results of the specification stage, a corresponding LSTR model is estimated using non-linear least squares and the results are reported in Table 3. The results are quite impressive. The resulting LSTR model provide evidence that the automated search procedure on the linearized model seems to provide a

Table 2: The baseline linearized model of the unemployment rate for the period 1979:4 to 2010:2 with S_t given by equation (3). The individual coefficient significance level is 10 percent.

Coefficients	Estimates	Std. Errors	t-values
$Const.$	0.56	0.090	6.26
U_{t-1}	-0.07	0.014	-4.88
ΔU_{t-2}	0.25	0.106	2.35
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t$	-0.15	0.015	-9.79
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-2}$	0.05	0.015	3.37
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-4}$	-0.03	0.011	-2.34
R	0.06	0.02	4.58
R_{t-2}	-0.05	0.014	-3.25
R_{t-4}	0.04	0.012	3.83
$\mathbb{D}PR_t$	0.08	0.014	5.42
$\mathbb{D}PR_{t-1}$	0.09	0.015	5.69
$\mathbb{D}PR_{t-2}$	0.04	0.012	3.04
$\mathbb{D}RXR_{t-1}$	-0.01	0.004	-2.95
S_t^3	1.13	0.352	3.20
$S_t^3 \cdot U_{t-1}$	-0.08	0.045	-1.77
$S_t^3 \cdot \Delta U_{t-2}$	-1.54	0.220	-6.98
$S_t^3 \cdot \Delta U_{t-3}$	1.03	0.180	5.75
$S_t^3 \cdot \mathbb{D}_4 Y_t$	-0.21	0.04	-4.77
$S_t^3 \cdot R_{t-2}$	0.38	0.063	6.03
$S_t^3 \cdot R_{t-3}$	-0.42	0.071	-5.98
$S_t^3 \cdot \mathbb{D}PR_{t-3}$	-0.26	0.063	-4.12
$S_t^3 \cdot \mathbb{D}RPR_t$	0.22	0.034	6.38
Diagnostics:			
RSS	2.24	$\hat{\sigma}$	0.15
AIC	-3.66	SC	-3.16
$F_{AR(1-5)}(5,97)$	0.35 [0.60]	$F_{RESET}(2, 100)$	3.66 [0.03]
$\chi^2_{normality}(2)$	0.30 [0.86]	$F_{het}(42,81)$	0.88 [0.67]

test with good power against linearity. Comparing the linear and the non-linear specifications, the similarities in the estimates as well as their significance are striking. The *Autometrics* procedure seems to have indicated very precisely the form of the LSTR specification, both in terms of which variables entering linearly and non-linearly as well as the form of their lag-polynomials. Finally, it can be seen that the LSTR model provides a good explanation of the data when compared against the simple univariate specification (Table 1) with both the standard error of the regression and the relevant information criteria (AIC and SC) substantially reduced.

The size of the steepness parameter ($\gamma = 19.02$) indicates a rapid change in the transition between periods of low and high unemployment. This suggests that a potential simplification of the LSTR model can be achieved by estimating a switching regression model, originally developed by ?

$$\Delta U_t = \sum_{i=1}^q \rho_{1i} X_{it} + \sum_{i=1}^q \rho_{2i} X_{it} I_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad (8)$$

where I_t is the Heaviside indicator function

$$I_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_t > c \\ 0 & \text{if } S_t < c \end{cases}. \quad (9)$$

In addition, the model can be further simplified by testing several interesting restrictions that have clear interpretations. For example, the coefficient estimates on $\mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-2}$, $\mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-3}$, R_{t-2} , and R_{t-3} suggest restrictions that would allow these terms to appear in the form $\Delta_2 (\mathbb{D}_4 Y - R)_{t-2}$. The interpretation of this restricted form is that unemployment decreases with positive changes in aggregate growth above the steady state.

5.3 Step 3: Evaluation and encompassing

The chosen model to be examined in terms of the evaluation and encompassing phase of the modelling cycle is, therefore, the restricted specification of Table 3 simplified to be a threshold model, with transition variable S_t as defined in equation (3), threshold parameter $\hat{c} = 0.71$ and augmented with all the terms of the general linear model (5). This general model is then tested down using *Autometrics*.

Table 3: The LSTAR model of the unemployment rate with S_t from equation (3) as the transition variable for the period 1979:4 to 2010:2.

Coefficients	Estimates	Std. Errors	t-values
Linear parameters:			
μ_1	0.54	0.081	6.04
U_{t-1}	-0.06	0.014	-4.63
ΔU_{t-2}	0.17	0.091	1.84
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t$	-0.14	0.016	-8.63
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-2}$	0.04	0.015	2.87
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_{t-4}$	-0.03	0.011	-2.70
R	0.06	0.012	5.20
R_{t-2}	-0.06	0.014	-3.92
R_{t-4}	0.05	0.012	4.30
$\mathbb{D}PR_t$	0.07	0.014	4.76
$\mathbb{D}PR_{t-1}$	0.07	0.015	4.74
$\mathbb{D}PR_{t-2}$	0.02	0.013	1.85
$\mathbb{D}RXR_{t-1}$	-0.01	0.004	-3.18
Transition parameters:			
γ	19.02	22.660	0.84
c	0.71	0.081	8.81
Non-linear parameters:			
μ_2	1.45	0.614	2.36
U_{t-1}	-0.20	0.114	-1.74
ΔU_{t-2}	-0.98	0.230	-4.25
ΔU_{t-3}	0.97	0.354	2.74
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t$	-0.26	0.126	-2.08
R_{t-2}	0.29	0.077	3.71
R_{t-3}	-0.27	0.091	-3.01
$\mathbb{D}PR_{t-3}$	-0.17	0.100	-1.72
$\mathbb{D}RPR_t$	0.08	0.040	2.13
Diagnostics:			
RSS	2.13	$\hat{\sigma}$	0.15
AIC	-3.67	SC	-3.18
$F_{AR(1-5)}(5,94)$	0.49 [0.79]	$F_{RESET}(2, 97)$	2.76 [0.07]

Table 4: The estimated threshold model of the unemployment rate with S_t defined in equation (3) as the transition variable for the period 1979:4 to 2010:2. The individual coefficient significance level is 5 percent.

Coefficients	Estimates	Std. Errors	t-values
$Const.$	0.63	0.071	8.86
U_{t-1}	-0.07	0.012	-5.71
$\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t$	-0.15	0.013	-11.7
R	0.06	0.009	6.08
$\Delta_2 (\mathbb{D}_4 Y - R)_{t-2}$	0.04	0.009	4.55
$\mathbb{D}PR_t + \mathbb{D}PR_{t-1}$	0.08	0.010	7.58
$\mathbb{D}PR_{t-2}$	0.03	0.011	2.94
$\mathbb{D}RXR_{t-1}$	-0.01	0.003	-3.85
I	1.24	0.298	4.15
$I \cdot U_{t-1}$	-0.16	0.037	-4.41
$I \cdot \Delta^2 U_{t-2}$	-0.76	0.143	-5.28
$I \cdot \mathbb{D}_4 Y_t$	-0.25	0.059	-4.22
$I \cdot \Delta R_{t-2}$	0.19	0.052	3.62
$I \cdot \mathbb{D}RPR_t$	0.05	0.018	2.76
Diagnostics:			
RSS	2.38	$\hat{\sigma}$	0.15
AIC	-3.72	SC	-3.40
$F_{AR(1-5)}(5,104)$	0.43 [0.83]	$F_{RESET}(2, 107)$	3.44 [0.04]
$\chi^2_{normality}(2)$	0.30 [0.86]	$F_{het}(25,97)$	0.98 [0.50]

The final preferred model is documented in Table 4. It is clear from these results that the chosen model encompasses the general linearized model. *Autometrics* chooses the simplified threshold model as the final specification, and the F-test of restrictions on the augmented generalized linear model has a p-value of $F_{pGUM} = 0.89$.

The results suggest that when unemployment is low and changes in unemployment are small, the Australian unemployment rate is predominantly a function of short-run shocks: the growth rate in aggregate demand $\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t = -0.15$, and the real interest rate $R_t = 0.06$; medium term effects: weighted average growth in productivity ($\mathbb{D}PR_t + \mathbb{D}PR_{t-1} + 0.5\mathbb{D}pr_{t-2}$) and competitiveness $\mathbb{D}RX R_{t-1} = -0.01$; long-run effects: $\Delta_2 (\mathbb{D}_4 Y - R)_{t-2} = 0.04$. Furthermore, the adjustment towards equilibrium unemployment is very slow $U_{t-1} = -0.07$ and depends strongly upon the earlier history $\Delta^2 U_{t-2} \equiv \Delta \Delta U_{t-2} = -0.76$.

If unemployment increases by more than .7 percentage points over 6 months, exceeding the threshold level, the dynamics are much more complex, with a quicker mean reversion towards the upper level of unemployment $U_{t-1} + I_t \cdot U_{t-1} = -0.23$. The main driver of continued high growth rates of unemployment is negative demand growth, $\mathbb{D}_4 Y_t + I_t \cdot \mathbb{D}_4 Y_t = -0.4$, while lowering real interest rates will facilitate bringing unemployment down. Another rather interesting result is the influence of the replacement ratio. Any move to increase the replacement ratio is likely to be counterproductive, although the effect is a small one $I \cdot \mathbb{D}RR_t = 0.05$ compared to the influence of negative growth in aggregate demand.

The model is consistent with the following plausible economic scenario. Suppose there is a large shock to unemployment caused by negative demand, as experienced during the three recessions covered by the current sample. This would cause the growth rate of unemployment to rise above the threshold level. During this period of rapid increase, the effects of aggregate demand are naturally stronger than in more normal times—the reaction is non-linear—and the mean reversion towards a new higher level is faster. This potential scenario is supported by Figure 3 which compares the estimated transition function from the model with the unemployment rate. The rapid increases in the unemployment rate, which occurred in Australia during the recessions of 1982/1983, 1990/1991 and 2008/2009 are associated with a switch in the transition function to the second regime where the main source of high unemployment growth is negative growth in aggregate demand. During this transition period, the development in unemployment is also sensitive to movements in the real interest rate and in the replacement ratio. In ‘normal’ times, the derived linear model is consistent with the predictions of a variety of economic theory models, predicting that movements in unemployment



Figure 3: The unemployment rate and the transition function.

are caused by low output growth, increases in real interest rates, changes in productivity, and in competitiveness.

Given its simplicity and parsimony, the switching model does a surprisingly good job of describing the unemployment process (Figure 4) which plots fitted values of the model against the actual unemployment rate. Clearly, the non-linear model does a good job of explaining the sharp pick-up in unemployment in Australia observed in the early 1980s, 1990s, and during the recent financial crisis.

6 Conclusion

The existing empirical work on Australian unemployment which models the unemployment rate directly in a single-equation framework makes the assumption that the unemployment rate is linear. This is inconsistent with empirical evidence which suggests that the structure of Australia's unemployment series is asymmetric. Consequently, this paper is concerned with building a non-linear model of the unemployment rate for Australia.

One of the interesting conclusions to emerge from this line of research is that automatic model selection has a potentially valuable role to play in non-linear econometric modelling. A cycle of specification, estimation, evaluation and en-




Figure 4: Actual and fitted values from the preferred threshold model using coefficient estimates reported in Table 4.

compassing is implemented to aide in the search for an effective model of the Australian unemployment rate. The final empirical model is both simple and parsimonious and is able to capture the dynamics of the Australian unemployment rate. The non-linear specification chosen represents an improvement in explanatory power by comparison with a baseline linear model.

From an economic perspective and in contrast to earlier, purely time-series-based models, it is found that several macroeconomic variables are important determinants of the unemployment rate in Australia. It is shown that changes in unemployment are predominantly a result of low output growth, increases in real interest rates, changes in productivity, and in competitiveness. Further, if changes in unemployment are big, the management of demand, real interest rates and the replacement ratio will be good instruments to start reducing unemployment.

A Data description and sources

- **Unemployment:** U

Definition: Number of unemployed people as a proportion of the civilian labour force (%). Seasonally adjusted.

Source: Reserve Bank of Australia, g07hist.xls.

- **Real output:** Y

Definition: Real GDP, chain volume measure. Seasonally adjusted.

Source: Reserve Bank of Australia, g10hist.xls.

- **Replacement ratio:** RPR

Definition: The ratio of nominal unemployment benefits per week (single over 21, no children) to average weekly earnings of all employees. Seasonally adjusted.

Source: Department of Social Security and the Reserve Bank of Australia, g06hist.xls.

- **Real interest rate:** R

Definition: 10 years government bonds less annual inflation in consumer price index.

Source: Reserve Bank of Australia, f02hist.xls and g02hist.xls.

- **Productivity:** PR

Definition: GDP per hour worked, index. Seasonally adjusted. Series ID: A2304192L

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 5206001_key_aggregates-1.xlsx.

- **Real exchange rate:** RXR

Definition: Real trade-weighted index.

Source: Reserve Bank of Australia, f15hist.xls

List of NCER Working Papers

No. 70 ([Download full text](#))

Tim Christensen, Stan Hurn and Ken Lindsay

Forecasting Spikes in Electricity Prices

No. 69 ([Download full text](#))

Don Harding and Adrian Pagan

Can We Predict Recessions?

No. 68 ([Download full text](#))

Amir Rubin and Daniel Smith

Comparing Different Explanations of the Volatility Trend

No. 67 ([Download full text](#))

Wagner Piazza Gaglianone, Luiz Renato Lima, Oliver Linton and Daniel Smith

Evaluating Value-at-Risk Models via Quantile Regression

No. 66 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker, Adam Clements and Robert O'Neill

A Kernel Technique for Forecasting the Variance-Covariance Matrix

No. 65 ([Download full text](#))

Stan Hurn, Andrew McClelland and Kenneth Lindsay

A quasi-maximum likelihood method for estimating the parameters of multivariate diffusions

No. 64 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker and Adam Clements

Volatility and the role of order book structure?

No. 63 ([Download full text](#))

Adrian Pagan

Can Turkish Recessions be Predicted?

No. 62 ([Download full text](#))

Lionel Page and Katie Page

Evidence of referees' national favouritism in rugby

No. 61 ([Download full text](#))

Nicholas King, P Dorian Owen and Rick Audas

Playoff Uncertainty, Match Uncertainty and Attendance at Australian National Rugby League Matches

No. 60 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker, Adam Clements and Robert O'Neill

A Cholesky-MIDAS model for predicting stock portfolio volatility

No. 59 ([Download full text](#))

P Dorian Owen

Measuring Parity in Sports Leagues with Draws: Further Comments

No. 58 ([Download full text](#))

Don Harding

Applying shape and phase restrictions in generalized dynamic categorical models of the business cycle

No. 57 ([Download full text](#))

Renee Fry and Adrian Pagan

Sign Restrictions in Structural Vector Autoregressions: A Critical Review

No. 56 ([Download full text](#))

Mardi Dungey and Lyudmyla Hvozdyk

Cojumping: Evidence from the US Treasury Bond and Futures Markets

No. 55 ([Download full text](#))

Martin G. Kocher, Marc V. Lenz and Matthias Sutter

Psychological pressure in competitive environments: Evidence from a randomized natural experiment: Comment

No. 54 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements and Annastiina Silvennoinen

Estimation of a volatility model and portfolio allocation

No. 53 ([Download full text](#))

Luis Catão and Adrian Pagan

The Credit Channel and Monetary Transmission in Brazil and Chile: A Structured VAR Approach

No. 52 ([Download full text](#))

Vlad Pavlov and Stan Hurn

Testing the Profitability of Technical Analysis as a Portfolio Selection Strategy

No. 51 ([Download full text](#))

Sue Bridgewater, Lawrence M. Kahn and Amanda H. Goodall

Substitution Between Managers and Subordinates: Evidence from British Football

No. 50 ([Download full text](#))

Martin Fukac and Adrian Pagan

Structural Macro-Econometric Modelling in a Policy Environment

No. 49 ([Download full text](#))

Tim M Christensen, Stan Hurn and Adrian Pagan

Detecting Common Dynamics in Transitory Components

No. 48 ([Download full text](#))

Egon Franck, Erwin Verbeek and Stephan Nüesch

Inter-market Arbitrage in Sports Betting

No. 47 ([Download full text](#))

Raul Caruso

Relational Good at Work! Crime and Sport Participation in Italy. Evidence from Panel Data Regional Analysis over the Period 1997-2003.

No. 46 ([Download full text](#)) (Accepted)

Peter Dawson and Stephen Dobson

The Influence of Social Pressure and Nationality on Individual Decisions: Evidence from the Behaviour of Referees

No. 45 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker, Adam Clements and Christopher Coleman-Fenn

Forecast performance of implied volatility and the impact of the volatility risk premium

No. 44 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements and Annastiina Silvennoinen

On the economic benefit of utility based estimation of a volatility model

No. 43 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements and Ralf Becker

A nonparametric approach to forecasting realized volatility

No. 42 ([Download full text](#))

Uwe Dulleck, Rudolf Kerschbamer and Matthias Sutter

The Economics of Credence Goods: On the Role of Liability, Verifiability, Reputation and Competition

No. 41 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements, Mark Doolan, Stan Hurn and Ralf Becker

On the efficacy of techniques for evaluating multivariate volatility forecasts

No. 40 ([Download full text](#))

Lawrence M. Kahn

The Economics of Discrimination: Evidence from Basketball

No. 39 ([Download full text](#))

Don Harding and Adrian Pagan

An Econometric Analysis of Some Models for Constructed Binary Time Series

No. 38 ([Download full text](#))

Richard Dennis

Timeless Perspective Policymaking: When is Discretion Superior?

No. 37 ([Download full text](#))

Paul Frijters, Amy Y.C. Liu and Xin Meng

Are optimistic expectations keeping the Chinese happy?

No. 36 ([Download full text](#))

Benno Torgler, Markus Schaffner, Bruno S. Frey, Sascha L. Schmidt and Uwe Dulleck

Inequality Aversion and Performance in and on the Field

No. 35 ([Download full text](#))

T M Christensen, A. S. Hurn and K A Lindsay

Discrete time-series models when counts are unobservable

No. 34 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements, A S Hurn and K A Lindsay

Developing analytical distributions for temperature indices for the purposes of pricing temperature-based weather derivatives

No. 33 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements, A S Hurn and K A Lindsay

Estimating the Payoffs of Temperature-based Weather Derivatives

No. 32 ([Download full text](#))

T M Christensen, A S Hurn and K A Lindsay

The Devil is in the Detail: Hints for Practical Optimisation

No. 31 ([Download full text](#))

Uwe Dulleck, Franz Hackl, Bernhard Weiss and Rudolf Winter-Ebmer

Buying Online: Sequential Decision Making by Shopbot Visitors

No. 30 ([Download full text](#))

Richard Dennis

Model Uncertainty and Monetary Policy

No. 29 ([Download full text](#))

Richard Dennis

The Frequency of Price Adjustment and New Keynesian Business Cycle Dynamics

No. 28 ([Download full text](#))

Paul Frijters and Aydogan Ulker

Robustness in Health Research: Do differences in health measures, techniques, and time frame matter?

No. 27 ([Download full text](#))

Paul Frijters, David W. Johnston, Manisha Shah and Michael A. Shields

Early Child Development and Maternal Labor Force Participation: Using Handedness as an Instrument

No. 26 ([Download full text](#))

Paul Frijters and Tony Beaton

The mystery of the U-shaped relationship between happiness and age.

No. 25 ([Download full text](#))

T M Christensen, A S Hurn and K A Lindsay

It never rains but it pours: Modelling the persistence of spikes in electricity prices

No. 24 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker, Adam Clements and Andrew McClelland

The Jump component of S&P 500 volatility and the VIX index

No. 23 ([Download full text](#))

A. S. Hurn and V. Pavlov

Momentum in Australian Stock Returns: An Update

No. 22 ([Download full text](#))

Mardi Dungey, George Milunovich and Susan Thorp

Unobservable Shocks as Carriers of Contagion: A Dynamic Analysis Using Identified Structural GARCH

No. 21 ([Download full text](#)) (forthcoming)

Mardi Dungey and Adrian Pagan

Extending an SVAR Model of the Australian Economy

No. 20 ([Download full text](#))

Benno Torgler, Nemanja Antic and Uwe Dulleck

Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, who is the Happiest of Them All?

No. 19 ([Download full text](#))

Justina AV Fischer and Benno Torgler

Social Capital And Relative Income Concerns: Evidence From 26 Countries

No. 18 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker and Adam Clements

Forecasting stock market volatility conditional on macroeconomic conditions.

No. 17 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker and Adam Clements

Are combination forecasts of S&P 500 volatility statistically superior?

No. 16 ([Download full text](#))

Uwe Dulleck and Neil Foster

Imported Equipment, Human Capital and Economic Growth in Developing Countries

No. 15 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker, Adam Clements and James Curchin

Does implied volatility reflect a wider information set than econometric forecasts?

No. 14 ([Download full text](#))

Renee Fry and Adrian Pagan

Some Issues in Using Sign Restrictions for Identifying Structural VARs

No. 13 ([Download full text](#))

Adrian Pagan

Weak Instruments: A Guide to the Literature

No. 12 ([Download full text](#))

Ronald G. Cummings, Jorge Martinez-Vazquez, Michael McKee and Benno Torgler

Effects of Tax Morale on Tax Compliance: Experimental and Survey Evidence

No. 11 ([Download full text](#))

Benno Torgler, Sascha L. Schmidt and Bruno S. Frey
The Power of Positional Concerns: A Panel Analysis

No. 10 ([Download full text](#))

Ralf Becker, Stan Hurn and Vlad Pavlov
Modelling Spikes in Electricity Prices

No. 9 ([Download full text](#))

A. Hurn, J. Jeisman and K. Lindsay
Teaching an Old Dog New Tricks: Improved Estimation of the Parameters of Stochastic Differential Equations by Numerical Solution of the Fokker-Planck Equation

No. 8 ([Download full text](#))

Stan Hurn and Ralf Becker
Testing for nonlinearity in mean in the presence of heteroskedasticity.

No. 7 ([Download full text](#)) (published)

Adrian Pagan and Hashem Pesaran
On Econometric Analysis of Structural Systems with Permanent and Transitory Shocks and Exogenous Variables.

No. 6 ([Download full text](#)) (published)

Martin Fukac and Adrian Pagan
Limited Information Estimation and Evaluation of DSGE Models.

No. 5 ([Download full text](#))

Andrew E. Clark, Paul Frijters and Michael A. Shields
Income and Happiness: Evidence, Explanations and Economic Implications.

No. 4 ([Download full text](#))

Louis J. Maccini and Adrian Pagan
Inventories, Fluctuations and Business Cycles.

No. 3 ([Download full text](#))

Adam Clements, Stan Hurn and Scott White
Estimating Stochastic Volatility Models Using a Discrete Non-linear Filter.

No. 2 ([Download full text](#))

Stan Hurn, J. Jeisman and K.A. Lindsay
Seeing the Wood for the Trees: A Critical Evaluation of Methods to Estimate the Parameters of Stochastic Differential Equations.

No. 1 ([Download full text](#))

Adrian Pagan and Don Harding
The Econometric Analysis of Constructed Binary Time Series.